

WORCESTER, MA 016150138

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
08/892,836	07/15/1997	MARCUS R. SKEEM	F-3278	7305
7590 05/20/2004		EXAMINER		
MARY E PORTER			NGUYEN, GEORGE BINH MINH	
NORTON COMPANY 1 NEW BOND STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOX NUMBER 15138			3723	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	08/892,836	SKEEM ET AL.			
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	George Nguyen	3723			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offit timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated.	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 31 March 2004. Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	•			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •	•			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>28,29 and 34</u> .					
Claim(s) objected to: 3,4 and 10.					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,5-9,11-26 and 30-33</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 2 and 27.					
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	royed or b) disapproved by t	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
10. Other:					
GEORGE NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER		Constant Name of			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) George Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3723 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Broadly speaking, "bonded abrasive grain" does not distinguish over the "bonded abrasive grain" from the prior art because the manner of how the abrasive grain is bonded to the tool is not germane to the issue of patentability of an article. Regarding to the properness of the 103 rejection, the Board of Appeal and Interference had previously confirmed this 103 rejection .